and certify as to ruinous buildings, the official referee might direct the proper parties to hoard them in.

In like manner, the removal of common privies or other nuisances, the due ventilation of buildings, the height and construction of factory chimneys, and other matters of detail, might be safely and usefully left to the intelligence of such three district surveyors, who should certify the facts with their opinions; and the official referee, if satisfied that the spirit and object of the Act, as to stability, and as to security against fire, and as to the promotion of health and comfort, are carried out as far as possible, he might be authorized to make an order to such effect as he might deem right. Questions of window light, drainage, and other easements might properly be referred to such a tribunal, saving the superior judges much valuable time, and really having the business better done than any ordinary jury can do it. All disputed accounts as to party walls might advantageously be left to their decision.

If any person should feel aggrieved by the certificate of the district surveyors, and the decision of the official referee as an individual, he might have an appeal to a court of official referees, consisting of the barrister, the architect, and the surveyor. This decision might be made final.

The district surveyors would be fairly paid by one guinea each for every party wall survey and certificate, and in cases of intermixed property they might have two guineas each; and minor cases might be paid for in proportion.

It cannot be supposed that such an off-hand suggestion as this can be any thing like perfect, but it may be worth consideration whether some such arrangement might not only be quite efficacious, but bring cheap justice home to every man's door; and the opinions of such well-practised men (for they would have quite enough for every day in the week) would be almost invaluable to the judges in difficult cases appertaining to buildings, and be almost, if not quite, equal in weight in their kind to those of the elder brethren of the Trinity House in questions requiring nautical experience.

As to the table of fees in clause 129, it is only marvellous that any expectants of office could have been so short-sighted as to open their mouths so wide. Strike off the fees of the official referees, and they are not quite so outrageous as at first sight they may appear, for it is to be remembered that all the rates are largely increased, and that additional labour and additional responsibility are imposed.

If the enormous fourth rates of the bill be legalized, a fee of four guineas might indeed be a little beyond the mark; but I doubt not the district surveyor had much rather have three times two guineas for the present fourth-rates, which would occupy the same ground as one of these monsters. As to two guineas for looking to the reparation of every broken tile or chimney pot, it is only a repetition of "too bad."

The truth is, Sir, that the whole system of levying fees upon you, me, or anybody, to pay a man for not allowing us to do as we please, and for forcing us to do that which we do not please, is altogether vicious. The surveyors ought to be paid out of a county rate or some such fund, not by salaries, but in proportion to the work they actually do. Or if the same amount of fee were paid beforehand for a license to build, as in the case of setting up a hoard or scaffold, I am satisfied it would be pleasanter for all parties than now it is. It would not be paid under some indefinite notion that fee is but another name for bribe. We should not slip down one ladder while the surveyor is mounting another, to avoid being dunned; and it would be far more profitable for the surveyor, it would be sure money, and he would not lose half his time in hunting after irrecoverable fees. We should meet as friends, not as debtor and creditor, and all the world can understand that difference.

Having thus, Sir, passed through some of the more important provisions of the Bill, will you bear with me in a few desultory remarks.

It is purposed to re-enact, with more stringency, the regulations of the existing law, as to the extent of warehouses and stabling. It has probably never been thought of by the framers of the clause 32, that their term "warehouse" will include buildings wholly different in character and use to the "stacks of warehouses," that is, warehouse floors, often occupied by different holders, and piled one above another, with one or more tiers of loopholes, communicating externally with each floor or warehouse, as especially described with mercantile accuracy in the existing law.

The restriction even of these to thirty-five squares, unless subdivided by party walls with iron doors, is best shewn to be commercially and usefully inconvenient, by the restriction being rendered inoperative by the legislature, with respect to the warehouses of the several dock companies.

The same remark may apply to stables. Scarcely any, if any, separate stable reaches to twenty-five squares; but the whole of an establishment of stabling may stretch far beyond it, yet subdivided by walls. Cui *bono* the enactment? You may indeed insist upon having iron doors, but what law can force them to be always shut?

As to the removal of dangerous or offensive manufactories within the next thirty years (clause 27). Independent of the inconsiderateness of measuring by one line businesses of ten pounds or one-hundred thousand pounds capital, it does seem to me more especially unjust as respects fellmongers, for they are generally situate in a peculiar locality, where they were originally formed in open fields, far away from ordinary dwelling-houses. Roads have been cut through them, houses have been built around and hemmed them in; and now, not the doers of the wrong, but the sufferers, are to be routed out. Is this British justice?

That any two justices of the peace, that any two half-informed barristers, under the name of stipendiary magistrates, should be intrusted with power to decide as to what is noxious and offensive, and to ruin a flourishing manufacturer, is certainly something less than wise.

Indeed the power to be given to any two magistrates to levy fines of from five pounds to five hundred pounds a day, under the proposed law, is so perfectly monstrous, that it can scarcely be persisted in.

A fine of five hundred pounds a day, if inflicted by a jury for some atrocious misdemeanour, would at once be set aside by the judges as excessive.

Clause 23. Rooms in basements are not to be dwelt in, unless they have areas three feet in width before and behind them. For what good reason? A dry area of one-third that width would be amply sufficient to keep the wall dry, and it would not force the front of the house to be set back behind the front line of its neighbours, leading to loss of ground, to loss in rent, to loss in trade, and producing unsightliness.

It is rather odd to find this clause so loosely worded, that while rooms in basements cannot be let, to dwell in, unless each have a window and a fire-place of specified size, the letting of upper rooms without windows or chimneys is not interdicted.

As to the formation of projections in front of a row of houses. Instead of having to call in, and pay district surveyors, and official referees, for deciding which line is the general line, could it not be enacted that, where two or more houses adjoin, and form a continuous row of less or greater length, no one shall build a projection on the ground story beyond the other houses, without the written consent of his neighbours and the owners of the houses? It may well happen that, in process of time, changes in the commercial character of a neighbourhood may render it necessary to convert a row of private houses into shops; and, to render shops profitable, they ought to reach to the public way.

A like restriction in the existing law has long been felt to be so serious an interference with the rights of property, that many magistrates have overborne the district surveyors, and, contrary to the law, have allowed front courts to be built over. And, if all the owners of one complete and undivided row of houses agree to do so, would it be wise, nay, would it be just, to interdict it?

It is curious to see that the same men who so wish to do this, cannot perceive any difficulty in especially providing that porticoes of churches and other structures may cover a public pathway, and destroy the shew of a line of shops!

There are very many other comments which might be made upon this beneficially intended, but ill digested Bill; yet, have I trespassed too much already. I will close my paper with suggesting that, possibly, it might be well to direct that, when doorways are found at the angles of houses, the whole height of the angle should either be canted or rounded off. Besides being a violation of the spirit of the law, as now often practised, it is an insecure mode of construction. This suggested alteration can do no harm, and while making it more convenient for passengers, it may render a room much pleasanter, by giving it an angular view along the public way.

I would also suggest that the water from the largely projecting cornices of houses and public buildings, and even of shop fronts, when oversailing the footpaths, should be so conveyed away, as not to drip upon passengers. It can very easily be guarded against, and I will also observe that if all rain-water pipes were made to discharge into the drain of the house, instead of their filthy waters running over the surface, London would be rendered much cleaner and less offensive.

I have but now, Sir, to return you my sincere thanks for your kindness. Conscious that I have been actuated by an earnest wish to see a wise and a good measure enacted, I trust that none of my observations have been uncourteous to those persons upon whom the very onerous task of producing the bill has devolved. In passing through it, I have sufficiently seen how great the difficulty must have been to get it even into its present state, imperfect though it be; and, could I dare dream of such a thing, should be most amply rewarded, if the lo[illegible] and ill-arranged remarks of an obscure and humble man, should in any way become conducive to the welfare of my fellow citizens, by drawing the attention of educated and experienced minds, to pursue the subject with far surpassing ability, although not with greater zeal.

Allow me to observe that, in your last number, page 233, the 47th line from the bottom, the word *not* should be expunged, its insertion spoils my meaning, which is this; that if the half party wall should cost seventy-five pounds, and the rack-rent should be one hundred pounds, fifteen shillings of that cost should be repaid by each receiver of rent, for every pound rent taken by him.

I beg to subscribe myself, Sir,

Your much obliged servant,

A BRICKBAT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BUILDER.

SIR,—My last communication having been acknowledged, I hope it will obtain insertion, together with my answer to Mr. Dean's letter, in the next number of your very valuable paper. Certainly, I entertain not a doubt that the candid minds of your intelligent correspondents and readers will most readily, after perusing these papers, give me full credit for the discovery to which I lay claim, viz. the true laws of nature, essentially requisite to be known, for the perfect construction of fire-places, without previous experiment, and for warming and ventilating rooms or buildings, so as to diffuse an equalized temperature of wholesome air, and also for effectually removing all disagreeable smell from places subjected to noxious effluvia. That my science *does* embrace these laws, my practice has sufficiently proved: and that I can secure these most desirable effects by the most simple and economical means nature herself will testify, by necessarily performing her work *uninterruptedly*. Machinery of every kind, chimney-pots, cowls, and all other elevations above the roofs of buildings, are as unnecessary as they are obnoxious to the eye of an architect, in destroying the uniformity or the beauty of architecture. The old system (if, indeed, that be worthy of the name, which consists in mere experiment, and subsequent correction of errors) I have proved to be incorrect. The laws of nature cannot fail, for they are uniform and immutable. Consequently, when positively attained, as they are by me, they may be applied with certainty of result.

Experiment implies ignorance of those laws, as essential principles of guidance; therefore, only seeks effects. This, at best, will but lead to art without science, to effects without reference to the cause or natural laws which produced them. Perfectly familiar as I am, per force of forty years' hard labour and study of natural philosophy in all its branches, I can always predicate and warrant the result of the application of an apparatus of a certain size to a given purpose. With my knowledge, subsequent alteration or amendment would be entirely precluded. In reference to Mr. Spencer's letter, I must refer him to the paper now under your consideration for THE BUILDER. But, in regard to economy, which he doubts, I beg to say that the architect, Mr. Charles Barry, ordered one of the firekeepers, in the severe winter of 1838, to measure the coke required to warm and ventilate the committee and dining-rooms, cloisters, &c. The result was this:—One apparatus warmed the five rooms above the crypt, or late Speaker's dining-room and passage, containing about 55,000 cubic feet of air. A mass of about 1,500,000 cubic feet of air was therefore warmed in twenty-four hours by one of my apparatus, and passed through the rooms day and night, constantly renewing the atmosphere in the same. Now, uniformly securing an even temperature of 65° to a million and a half cubic feet of air, in the severest weather how small a quantity of coke or coal would Mr. Spencer call economy? Would he be satisfied with my answer, 3½ bushels? This was the quantity consumed during twenty-four hours.

Without wishing to digress from the subject of "warming and ventilation *alone*," I confess I think Mr. Spencer somewhat *immoderate* in his expectations, when he, acknowledging the vast compass of science embraced by this subject, viz. "physiology, chemistry, pneumatics, hydrostatics, hydraulics, pyronomics, mechanics, &c." almost in the same breath coolly *demands my system for discussion!* Had this very reasonable Mr. S. expended some thousands of pounds, as I have done, in the pursuit of science, in the course of 40 years' study and practice, and his exertions and immense sacrifices, to say nothing of personal perils and sufferings, had at length been crowned with success in the attainment of a valuable and most useful science hitherto unknown, I will not ask interrogatively, *would he?* but I will venture to assert affirmatively, he *would not* make so light of the discovered gem in philoso-

Tell us about OCR and PDF Compression at TheP...